DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 516 CS 505 210

AUTHOR Plax, Timothy G.; And Others
TITLE Communicating Control in the Classroom and Satisfaction with Teaching and Students.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change; Behavior Modification; Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Student Behavior; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS *Behavior Alteration Techniques

ABSTRACT

Two studies explored the relationship between the use of the behavior alteration techniques (BATS) in the classroom and teachers' satisfaction with their profession and students. In the first study, 351 elementary and secondary teachers completed two instruments. In the second study, 326 college instructors completed the same two instruments. Results of data analysis revealed that BATS was a significant predictor of satisfaction for teachers at all levels of instruction. Elementary and secondary teachers' use of primarily antisocial BATs was negatively related to their satisfaction. College teachers' use of prosocial BATs was positively associated with their satisfaction. One explanation for this may be that more incidents of misbehavior occur at the elementary and secondary levels than at the college level. (DF)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.



ED266516

# Communicating Control in the Classroom and Satisfaction with Teaching and Students

Timothy G. Plax
Space Transportation & Systems Division
Rockwell International, Downey, CA

Patricia Kearney*
California State University, Sacramento

Timothy M. Downs
University of Oklahoma

Running Head: SATISFACTION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Kearney
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*Correspondence regarding this paper should be sent to the second author, Patricia Kearney, at the Department of Communication Studies, 6000 J Street, California State University-Sacramento, Sacramento, CA 95819. (916) 454-6688 or (916) 482-8288.

CS505210

Abstract

This investigation reports the findings of two studies designed to explore the relationship between the use of Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) in the classroom and teacher satisfaction toward their profession and students. Results indicated that BAT use was a significant predictor of satisfaction for teachers at all levels of instruction. Specifically, elementary and secondary teachers' (Study 1) use of primarily antisocial BATs was shown to be negatively related to their satisfaction, whereas the use of primarily prosocial BATs was unrelated to satisfaction. In contrast, college teachers' (Study 2) use of prosocial BATs was positively associated with their satisfaction, but antisocial BAT use was unrelated. Interpretation of findings and discussion of differences were based on an analysis of the managerial demands and techniques available to teachers of younger students versus teachers of more adult-learners.

Communicating Control in the Classroom and

Satisfaction with Teaching and Students

While the instructional literature is highly representative of studies investigating students' attitudes toward classroom instruction, teachers, or course content, very little research has focused on teachers' affect toward their profession and their students. Nevertheless, the teaching profession has suffered from high turn-over rates among beginning teachers (Mouly, 1973), increasing reports of job stress or "burn-out" among more experienced teachers (Cichon & Koff, 1980; Feitler & Tokar, 1982), and most recently, the inability to attract reasonably qualified prospective teachers (Duke & Jones, 1984). Of those studies which have examined teachers' job satisfaction, few have isolated indicators of teachers' satisfaction toward their primary job responsibility, instruction or student learning. Instead, variables have been identified which impact teachers' satisfaction toward their immediate supervisor, promotion, co-workers, and pay (Conway, 1976; Currie, 1983; Falcione, McCroskey, & Daly, 1977; Hurt & Teigen, 1977; Richmond, Davis, Saylor, & McCroskey, 1984; Richmond & McCroskey, 1979; Richmond, McCroskey, & Davis, 1982). While these criterial assessments of satisfaction may contribute to potential recruitment, productivity enhancement, or job retention in a variety of industrial or service organizations, we argue that teachers derive their satisfaction primarily from classroom instruction and their clientele, the students.

In support of this argument, those studies which sampled employees from both educational and other service/industrial organizations consistently report typical predictors of job satisfaction as <u>less</u> meaningful for teachers (Falcione et al., 1977; Richmond, Davis, Saylor, & McCroskey, 1984). In contrast to research which normally defines the primary dimensions of job satisfaction to be employees' perceptions of supervisors, pay, co-workers, promotion, and the work itself (Smith,

Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), the educational literature offers an alternative point of view. Relying on the work of Locke (1969, 1970) and Friedlander (1964), teacher job satisfaction can be interpreted as an emotional state resulting from the self-appraisal of one's own classroom performance. This perspective does not preclude the viability of other criterial attributes of the construct (e.g., pay, co-workers). However, we suggest that investigations of satisfaction with teaching should focus on those areas of central concern to teachers, areas which probably prompted their decision to enter the profession and may also determine their on-going commitment to remain productive instructors.

Consistent with this focus, the present study was designed to examine potential predictors of teachers' satisfaction with their profession and with students in particular. Recognizing that teachers' self-appraisal of their own performance may be determined, in part, by their abilities to maintain student on-task behaviors, teachers' satisfaction or dissatisfaction may stem from their effectiveness at gaining student control. This relationship is particularly important considering that effective teaching performance is often equated with classroom control (c.f., Hoy, 1968). Consequently, both frequency of student control attempts and types of control strategies employed may contribute to teacher job satisfaction. The present investigation examined whether both elementary and secondary teachers' as well as college instructors' satisfaction are a function of the specific communication techniques they report using to gain student compliance in the classroom.

## Teacher Job Satisfaction

A number of factors influence teachers' attitudes toward their job. Frequently cited factors are stress, low salary, and the amount of time required for non-teaching duties (National Education Association [NEA], 1981). Other surveys point to difficulties with administrators, inconsistent support staff, excessive clerical and paper work, and lack of recognition for "a job well done" (Lawrenson & McKinnon,

1980). In spite of these organizational problems and increasing non-instructional responsibilities, educators continue to find satisfaction from actual classroom teaching and teacher/student relationships (Lawrenson & McKinnon, 1980). Indeed, the factor which appears as paramount to teachers' job satisfaction is "working with students" (Holdaway, 1978). This finding is not only evidenced with elementary and secondary teachers, but with college teachers as well. A survey of Western and Eastern faculty at two year colleges showed that satisfaction was substantially associated with in-class student-related activities (Cohen, 1973). With the exception of assistant professors who derived their satisfaction from publications, both associate and full professors at a major research university also reported that their greatest sense of accomplishment resulted from teaching and working with students (Braskamp, Fowler, & Ory, 1982).

Similarly, Mohrman, Cook, and Mohrman (1978) found that teacher satisfaction was a function of a variety of in-class issues. Of primary importance to elementary and secondary teachers were decisions concerning classroom instruction and student discipline. In contrast, noninstructional decisions (e.g., budget, personnel, grievances) were shown to be unrelated to teacher satisfaction. Consistent with these findings, instructional communication researchers have been unable to isolate either organizational or external predictors of teacher satisfaction toward the work itself (e.g., classroom instruction and student discipline). Only one recent study has identified a predictor of teacher satisfaction toward their actual work. In that investigation, Hurt and Teigen (1977) isolated teacher innovativeness as a contributor to teacher work satisfaction. Interestingly, the innovativeness of the educational organization did not similarly contribute to teacher job satisfaction. Moreover, investigators have noted the contributions of supervisor (principal or dean) - subordinate (teacher) relational variables as mediators of teacher satisfaction toward pay, co-workers, and/or supervision but not toward the work

itself (Currie, 1983; Falcione et al., 1977; Richmond & McCroskey, 1979). Consequently, teacher satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their work may be tied to those classroom factors which reflect the teachers' potential to influence. Of primary concern to this study are teachers' classroom management decisions.

## Classroom Management

While classroom management typically refers to those teacher activities which prevent student disruptions (Brophy, 1983), the literature in this area also focuses on strategies which impact student on-task compliance when the teacher is faced with potential or actual student resistance (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984, 1985; McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, & Kearney, in press; Plax, Kearney, Downs, & Stewart, 1984; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1985; Plax, Kearney, & Tucker, 1984; Stewart, Kearney, & Plax, in press). Both perspectives emphasize the need to maximize time spent on academic tasks. In this way, teaching performance and student learning are enhanced when the classroom is effectively managed (Brophy, 1979, 1983; Good, 1979).

Several studies support a relationship between teacher work or in-class satisfaction and classroom management skills or constraints. Citing the discipline of students as the major problem facing our schools (Gallup, 1981), teachers similarly complain that their work satisfaction often decreases because of the poor procedures available for handling discipline (NEA, 1981). Unable to effectively monitor and control students in an overcrowded classroom, teachers report declining levels of satisfaction when class size and student load are increased (McCaskill, Seifert, & Neely, 1979). Nearly half of all public school teachers report that student misbehavior frequently interferes with their instruction (NEA, 1983). Moreover, such misbehaviors are primary contributors to teacher stress (Cichon & Koff, 1980; Feitler & Tokar, 1982). Finally, those who leave the profession early in their careers cite student discipline as an important reason for their dissatisfaction with the

profession (Mouly, 1973). Reinforcing this perception, the public also implicates student discipline as the critical cause of teacher turn-over (Gallup, 1982). Frequent student disruptions, coupled with a lack of systematic training in classroom management (Duke & Jones, 1984; Plax, Kearney, & Tucker, 1985) then, have contributed significantly to teachers' dissatisfaction.

An area of classroom management that has received recent intensive study by instructional communication researchers is teacher use of Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) in the classroom. Conceptually categorized into power-based teacher influence techniques (Kearney et al., 1984, 1985), BATs represent an empirically derived typology of strategies and representative messages that teachers commonly employ to gain student compliance. In a series of studies on teacher power in the classroom (Kearney et al., 1984, 1985; McCroskey et al., in press; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1985), researchers found that teachers' selective use of BATs was related to student perceptions of affect, teacher immediacy, and teacher training in communication principles. In a separate, but related line of research, selective BAT use was also found to predict student resistance (Plax, Kearney, Stewart, & Downs, 1985; Stewart, Kearney, & Plax, in press). Within these two programmatic efforts, only one study thus far, has examined teacher BAT use and teacher job satisfaction (Kearney et al., 1985). Finding no relationship between the two variables, results can be explained to be a function of a reliance on an initial BAT typology that was neither specifically tied to the classroom context nor was it represented by actual teacher messages commonly used in the classroom. Employing a recently extended teacher-based message typology specifically targeted toward classroom management (Kearney et al., 1984) would appear to be a more accurate test of the relationship between BAT use and satisfaction with the teaching profession and students.

## Hypotheses

A variety of studies indicate that teacher satisfaction is associated with "working with students." Viewed in this way, teacher satisfaction toward their primary job responsibilities (teaching and students) would appear to be a function of classroom-specific variables which are normally under the direct influence of teachers themselves. Given that student in-class disruptions have been tied consistently with teacher reports of dissatisfaction, it is reasonable to assume that the way teachers manage their students through the use of selected BATs may contribute meaningfully to teacher satisfaction with their profession and with their students.

Unlike McCroskey et al. (in press) who conclude that student, rather than teacher, perceptions of teacher BAT use provide a more valid indicator of students' affect, we argue that teacher, rather than student, perceptions of teacher BAT use provide a more valid indicator of teachers' satisfaction. That is, teacher perceptions of what they do are more likely to affect their own perceptions of how they feel toward students and teaching. Regardless of the presumed or questionable accuracy of either student or teacher perceptions, however, we reasoned that teachers' self-reported satisfaction is a function of their self-appraisals regarding their classroom management performance. Consequently, it is the teachers', rather than the students', construction of the classroom reality that is more likely to affect teacher satisfaction. Thus,

$H_1$: Teachers' selective use of BATs will be significantly associated with their satisfaction toward teaching and students.

Moreover, we reasoned that the specific types of BATs employed by teachers may be related to reports of their satisfaction. There are several issues which suggest this relationship. First, earlier research identified a positive relationship between teacher use of prosocial or reward-based BATs and students'

affect. Conversely, teacher use of antisocial or punishment-based BATs were shown to be negatively associated with students' affect (McCroskey et al., in press; Plax, Kearney, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1985). As a result, we might suspect that teachers who are confronted with positively or negatively-disposed students in the classroom will mirror a similar affective orientation toward their profession and students. Second, the use of prosocial BATs has been reported by teachers to be more effective in managing student behaviors than the use of antisocial BATs (Kearney et al., 1984, 1985). Consequently, teachers who perceive themselves as employing primarily prosocial type BATs may also perceive themselves as effective and thus, more satisfied than those who employ primarily antisocial type BATs. Third, just as students tend to accept personal responsibility for good outcomes and attribute to teachers or others blame for bad outcomes (Dickens & Perry, 1982), teachers as well, may differentially report satisfaction as a function of their use of BAT type. That is, teachers may be more likely to attribute their use of prosocial, effective BATs to self-perceptions of their effectiveness as a classroom manager. In turn, teachers who use primarily antisocial BATs may attribute their ineffectiveness not to self, but to students or the teaching profession in general. Thus,

$H_2$: Teachers' selective use of primarily prosocial type BATs will be significantly and positively associated with their satisfaction toward teaching and students.

$H_3$: Teachers' selective use of primarily antisocial type BATs will be significantly and negatively associated with their satisfaction toward teaching and students.

## Procedures

The three hypotheses advanced in the present investigation were tested in two separate studies. In Study 1, 351 elementary and secondary teachers drawn

from county school systems within an Eastern state were asked to complete two instruments: BATs and teacher satisfaction. Teaching experience ranged from one to thirty years. In Study 2, 326 college instructors at a large university within the same Eastern state as Study 1 were asked to complete the two instruments. College teaching experience ranged from one to forty years. Teachers from both samples were told that the purpose of the questionnaires was to investigate commonly employed classroom management techniques. Participation was voluntary; responses were anonymous.

Measurement

Behavior Alteration Techniques: BATs. Participants from both samples were provided with 22 sets of Behavior Alteration Messages (BAMs) representing each of the BATs generated by Kearney et al. (1984). While the BAMs reflected messages amenable to elementary and secondary teachers, the BAMs for the college teacher sample were modified to more closely approximate sample messages a college instructor might use (Plax et al., 1985). BAT labels were omitted from the questionnaire. To measure the frequency with which teachers perceived they use each BAT, instructors

---

Table 1 about here

---

were asked to rate on a 1-5 scale "how frequently you use statements of each type to get your students to modify their behaviors in the classroom." Higher scores indicated greater frequency. The BAT instrument was conceptually designed to reflect 22 relatively separate and independent sets of message groupings. Based on data from this study and that obtained from previous research on other teachers (Kearney et al., 1984, 1985) and students (McCroskey et al., in press), no meaningful underlying factor structures have been obtained.

Teacher Satisfaction: SAT. Unlike previous measures of teacher job satisfaction which typically assess attitudes toward pay, co-workers, supervisors,

promotion, etc., in this study the assessment was conceptually and operationally targeted at classroom teaching and students. While other factors contribute to overall job satisfaction, pertinent to this investigation was teachers' attitudes toward the dynamics of classroom teaching which are normally under the influence of teachers themselves (c.f., Kearney et al., 1984).

Consequently, teacher satisfaction encompassed satisfaction toward (1) teaching and (2) students. The items generated for the teaching component of SAT were: (1) Have you ever considered quitting teaching? Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Usually, Always; (2) Everything considered, how satisfying has teaching been for you? Very Satisfying, Satisfying, Somewhat Satisfying/Somewhat Dissatisfying, Dissatisfying, Very Dissatisfying; (3) If you had your life to live over, do you think you would go into teaching as a profession? Definitely, Probably, Possibly, Probably Not, Definitely Not. The items generated for the student component of SAT were: (4) Are you generally comfortable with the cooperation exhibited by your students in your classes? Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Usually, Always; (5) In general, how satisfied are you with the motivation of the students you teach? Very satisfied, Satisfied, Somewhat Satisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied; (6) How satisfied are you with the general level of students' abilities in your classes? Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Somewhat Satisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied. Items on both components were randomly ordered to avoid response bias. Response options were reflected so that higher scores indicated greater satisfaction.

Factor analysis of participants' responses to all six items revealed that all items had their primary loading on the first unrotated factor. Employing an oblique rotation and forcing two factors resulted in an interpretable two-factor solution with all items in each set having their primary loading on their intended factor: Satisfaction toward teaching (items 1, 2, 3) and satisfaction toward students

(items 4, 5, 6). For Study 1, primary loadings associated with the teaching SAT ranged from .76 to .90 and from .67 to .72 on student SAT (interfactor correlation = .30). For Study 2, primary loadings for teaching SAT ranged from .70 to.76 and from .41 to.93 for student SAT (interfactor correlation = .41). Subsequent analyses employed scores from the six-item total SAT measure as well as the three-item component measures of teaching and student SAT. For Study 1, alpha reliabilities for total SAT were .76 ($\bar{X}$ = 21.95, s.d. = 3.17); teaching SAT, .88 ($\bar{X}$ = 11.25, s.d. = 2.27); and student SAT, .85 ($\bar{X}$ = 10.70, s.d. = 1.61). For Study 2, alpha reliabilities for total SAT were .91 ($\bar{X}$ = 22.53, s.d. = 3.42); teaching SAT, .85 ($\bar{X}$ = 11.63, s.d. = 2.31); and student SAT, .86 ($\bar{X}$ = 10.91, s.d. = 1.78).

## Results

Testing hypothesis one required multiple regression analysis with all 22 BATs comprising the predictor set and total SAT as the single criterion. Results indicated a significant relationship between BAT use and total SAT for elementary and secondary teachers in Study 1 ($\underline{R}^2$ = .19, $\underline{F}$ = 3.49, $\underline{df}$ = 22/349, $\underline{p} < .0001$) and for college teachers in Study 2 ($\underline{R}^2$ = .14, $\underline{F}$ = 2.26, $\underline{df}$ = 22/324, $\underline{p} < .001$). Additionally, two separate canonical correlation analyses were computed with the 22 BATs as predictors and the two component measures of satisfaction as criterion variables. For both samples, results revealed one significant canonical root (Study 1: $\underline{R}_c$ = .44, $\underline{R}_c^2$ = .19, Wilks Lambda = .76, Approx. $\underline{F}$ = 2.18, $\underline{df}$ = 44/652, $\underline{p} < .001$. Study 2: $\underline{R}_c$ = .38, $\underline{R}_c^2$ = .15, Wilks Lambda = .81, Approx. $\underline{F}$ = 1.57, $\underline{df}$ = 44/602, $\underline{p} < .01$).

In order to further probe these relationships, supplementary analyses included multiple regression with all 22 BATs as predictors and teaching SAT as the criterion. Results revealed a significant relationship for Study 1 ($\underline{R}^2$ = .15, $\underline{F}$ = 2.68, $\underline{df}$ = 22/350, $\underline{p} < .0001$) and Study 2 ($\underline{R}^2$ = .11, $\underline{F}$ = 1.74, $\underline{df}$ = 22/324, $\underline{p} < .05$). Similarly,

with student SAT as the criterion, multiple regression analyses indicated a significant relationship between BAT use and student SAT for Study 1 ($\underline{R}^2 = .14$, $\underline{F} = 2.35$, $\underline{df} = 22/350$, $\underline{p} < .001$) and Study 2 ($\underline{R}^2 = .12$, $\underline{F} = 1.96$, $\underline{df} = 22/324$, $\underline{p} < .01$). Thus, for both samples $H_1$ was supported.

In order to test hypotheses two and three, simple correlations were computed between each of the 22 BATs and teaching SAT and student SAT. As Table 2 indicates, seven BATs generated significant correlations with teaching SAT for Study 1 (elementary and secondary sample). Immediate Reward from Behavior was positively

---

Table 2 about here

---

associated with teaching SAT, whereas, Punishment from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Legitimate-Teacher Authority, Normative Rules, and Expert Teacher were negatively associated. In contrast, for Study 2 (college sample), only three BATs were significantly associated with teaching SAT and all three were positively related: Immediate Reward from Behavior, Deferred Reward from Behavior, and Peer Modeling.

Obtained correlations between BAT use and student SAT revealed that six BATs were significantly correlated for Study 1. Immediate Reward from Behavior and Self-Esteem were positively associated, while Deferred Reward from Behavior, Punishment from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, and Legitimate-Teacher Authority were negatively correlated with student SAT. Unlike Study 1, no BATs were significantly and negatively correlated with student SAT for college teachers in Study 2. Instead, eight BATs were significantly and positively associated with student SAT: Immediate Reward from Behavior, Deferred Reward from Behavior, Reward from Others, Self-Esteem, Guilt, Responsibility to Class, Altruism, and Peer Modeling. (Statistical power estimates for the nonsignificant correlations were greater than .995 for a medium effect size at alpha =.05 for both samples).

These results suggest only partial support for hypotheses two and three. For Study 1, the use of primarily prosocial type BATs fails to be meaningfully associated with either teaching or student SAT, whereas the use of primarily antisocial type BATs is negatively associated with each indicator of SAT. The opposite appears to be the case for Study 2. Prosocial BATs are positively related to both SAT variables, whereas antisocial BATS fail to be meaningfully associated with either variable. This trend also holds for simple correlations obtained between BAT use and total SAT. In Study 1, primarily antisocial BATs were negatively associated with total SAT, whereas in Study 2, primarily prosocial BATS were positively correlated with total SAT (see Table 2).

In order to probe further the nature of these relationships, simple correlations were also computed between summed scores across "prosocial" BATs and responses to each measure of SAT, as well as summed scores across "antisocial" BATs and each SAT variable. Conceptually and empirically defined as reward-oriented, Kearney et al. (1984) and Plax et al. (1985) identified Immediate Reward from Behavior, Deferred Reward, Reward from Teacher, Reward from Others, Self-Esteem, and Teacher/Student Relationship-Positive as prosocial type BATs. Similarly, these same researchers identified punishment-oriented or antisocial BATs to be Punishment from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, Punishment from Others, Guilt, Teacher/Student Relationship-Negative, Legitimate-Higher Authority and Legitimate-Teacher Authority. Alpha reliabilities for prosocial items for Study 1 were .80 and Study 2, .81. Reliabilities for antisocial items for Study 1 were .86 and Study 2, .86. For Study 1, results indicated a nonsignificant relationship between prosocial BATs and each SAT variable ($p > .05$). For Study 2, correlations between total prosocial BATs and each SAT variable were significant and positive (total SAT $r$ = .19, teaching SAT $r$ = .16, and student SAT $r$ = .15, $p < .01$). Obtained correlations between total antisocial BATs and each SAT variable were significant and negative

for Study 1 (total SAT $r$ = -.23, teaching SAT $r$ = -.19, student SAT $r$ = -.17, $p < .01$), but nonsignificant for Study 2 ($p > .05$).

Further supplementary analysis examined the frequency with which teachers from both samples employed each BAT. Based on the criteria of mean scores above 3.0 and frequency scores for responses 4 and 5 (often and very often) above 40%, four BATs were reported as "frequently used" by elementary and secondary teachers: Immediate Reward from Behavior, Deferred Reward, Self-Esteem and Teacher Feedback. For college teachers, two BATs were reported as "frequently used:" Deferred Reward from Behavior and Teacher Feedback. Based on the criteria of mean scores below 3.0 and frequency scores for responses 1 and 2 (never and seldom) above 40%, all other BATs except Expert Teacher were reported as "infrequently used" for the elementary and secondary teacher sample. Similarly, college teachers reported infrequent use of all other BATs except Immediate Reward from Behavior and Self-Esteem. However, the college teacher sample reported greater "infrequency of use" than did the elementary/secondary teacher sample. That is, teacher scores for those BATs infrequently used from Study 1 were consistently above 2 (seldom), whereas college teacher scores were consistently below 2 (never). Consequently, both groups reported greater use of particular prosocial BATs and infrequent use of antisocial and other BAT types, with college teachers reporting an even greater infrequency of use.

## Discussion

This investigation reports the findings of two studies designed to predict teachers' satisfaction toward their profession and their students. Study 1 examined elementary and secondary teachers' work satisfaction. Study 2 focused on college instructors. Based on the reasoning that teachers may be more or less satisfied as a function of their abilities to effectively manage students, both studies assessed the relationship between teacher satisfaction and the selective use of

Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) in the classroom. The results relating to our first hyopthesis indicated that selective BAT use was a significant predictor of teacher satisfaction for teachers at all levels of instruction.

Even though the variance in teaching and student satisfaction explained by BAT use was less than anticipated (19% for Study 1; 14% for Study 2), the data are potentially more meaningful than the results would immediately suggest. Considering that other researchers have been unable to explain teachers' actual work satisfaction as a function of a variety of organizational variables, the results of this invesstigation indicate that relevant teacher in-class activities are probably more pertinent to teacher work satisfaction. Of course, the use of BATs by teachers is only one area that may influence teachers' satisfaction. A variety of other in-class factors (e.g., class size, teachers' communicative competence as an information disseminator, teachers' familiarity with the subject content, and student individual differences) may also determine the level of teacher satisfaction toward their profession and students. Consequently, a larger percentage of variance might be explained by the contribution of these other in-class variables.

Moreover, teacher compliance-gaining attempts may be indicative of a series of management-related behaviors that conceivably could impact teacher satisfaction. For instance, the necessity to use BATs implies that student misbehaviors (or off-task behaviors) occur. The fact that students <u>do</u> misbehave suggests that teachers may be ineffective at managing the learning environment in such a way that students remain on-task. If so, the use of BATs may be symptomatic of other teacher behaviors (or the lack of behaviors) that interfere with their abilities to prevent student disruptions (e.g., poor "withitness" skills, negative questioning techniques, insufficient motivational messages, misuse of prompts). Examining a variety of specific classroom management behaviors then, may increase our understanding of teacher satisfaction.

The results relating to hypotheses two and three further indicate that the type of BATs employed differentially contribute to satisfaction with teaching and students. Interestingly, the findings from Study 1 differ substantially from the findings of Study 2. For elementary and secondary teachers, the use of primarily prosocial BATs failed to be meaningfully associated with either teaching or student satisfaction. For the college teacher sample, however, the use of prosocial BATs and satisfaction were positively related. In contrast, the use of antisocial BATs and teaching/student satisfaction were negatively related for elementary and secondary teachers, but unrelated for college instructors.

Pertinent to the interpretation of these findings are the potential managerial demands involved with elementary or secondary students, as opposed to college-age learners. Given differences in age, maturational levels, and elective versus compulsory attendance for the two groups of students, more incidences of misbehavior may occur in the elementary/secondary classroom. As a result, elementary or secondary teachers may actually engage in more frequent control attempts than college teachers. By necessity then, elementary/secondary teachers may also use a greater variety of BAT types. The results of this study confirm this analysis: Elementary and secondary teachers reported higher frequencies and greater diversity of BATs employed than did college teachers. While elementary/secondary teachers reported a greater reliance on prosocial techniques overall, such strategies may be ineffective for particular non-compliant students or persistent resistors. As a result, teachers may ultimately resort to antisocial BAT use. The frustration of non-compliance coupled with the use of punishment-based BATs may then lead to reduced satisfaction with their own teaching and students in general.

Finding no relationship between prosocial BAT use and satisfaction for elementary and secondary teachers may be explained by instructors tendency to place less value on what they do effectively. This may be highlighted when their successes are contrasted with their inability to gain compliance from other students. Instead,

teachers may selectively perceive their "problem" students as more salient than their more compliant student peers. Consequently, when the use of prosocial BATs is effective at gaining student compliance, teachers may overlook or discount these experiences as particularly successful.

In contrast, when college student off-task behaviors occur, the use of prosocial BATs may be sufficient to gain adult student compliance. Observing behavior change as a result of occasional prosocial BAT use may then lead to increased satisfaction for college teachers. The fact that antisocial BAT use was unrelated to satisfaction may be explained by the relative non-use of this BAT type. Unlike elementary/secondary teachers who must desist inappropriate behaviors as they occur, college instructors may avoid open classroom confrontations and instead, engage in private discourse with the noncompliant student after class, process "drop slips," or give final grade reductions. Besides potential differences in managerial demands, then, the managerial options available to college instructors may differ substantially from teachers of younger students.

While the present investigation does suggest a BAT use/type and teaching/student satisfaction relationship, we cannot conclude without pointing to two reservations about this research. First, BATs and satisfaction may be indicative of mutual causality. Even though we have argued that selective BAT use may be predictive of teacher satisfaction, it is possible that teachers' satisfaction may determine the frequency and type of BATs selected to control students. The methods employed in this study preclude a final statement of causal effects. However, it is reasonable to assume that over time, teachers' satisfaction may be both a cause and a consequence of BAT use/type. For example, experienced teachers who have a history of student and teaching dissatisfaction may resort to using antisocial techniques simply because they are now predisposed to believe that teaching is unrewarding and students are resistant to learning. In turn, the use of

antisocial strategies may serve to strengthen or reinforce negative perceptions of teaching and students.

Second, the results obtained from this research relied on a measure of satisfaction that assessed teachers' general appreciation of their profession and specific attitudes toward their students. While the instrument was determined to have reliability as well as predictive validity, the results also suggest that teachers' satisfaction with their work may include other, additional factors. By inductively deriving those factors that teachers themselves report as criterial for their satisfaction with their in-class activities and responsibilities, a more inclusive measure of satisfaction may be operationalized.

References

Braskamp, L. A., Fowler, D. L., & Ory, J. D. (1982). Faculty development and achievement: A faculty's view. (Report No. HE 015 078). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 626).

Brophy, J. E. (1979). Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 733-750.

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Classroom organization and management. Elementary School Journal, 83, 265-286.

Cichon, D., & Koff, R. (1980). Stress and teaching. NASSP Bulletin, 64, 91-104.

Cohen, A. M. (1973). Work satisfaction among junior college faculty members. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (ERIC Reproduction No. ED 081 426).

Conway, J. A. (1976). Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 130-139.

Currie, P. L. (1983). The relationship between principal's management communication style and teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento.

Dickens, W. J., & Perry, R. P. (1982). Perceived control in the college classrooms: The impact of teacher and student characteristics. (Report No. HE 015 973). Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Edinburgh, Scotland. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 227 736).

Duke, D. L., & Jones, V. F. (1984). Two decades of discipline--Assessing the development of an educational specialization. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17, 25-35.

Falcione, R. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of employee's communication apprehension, self-esteem and perceptions of their

immediate supervisors. In B. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 1 (pp. 363-375). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Feitler, F., & Tokar, E. (1982). Getting a handle on teacher stress: How bad is the problem? Educational Leadership, 39, 456-458.

Friedlander, F. (1964). Job characteristics as satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 388-392.

Gallup, G. H. (1981). The 13th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 33-47.

Gallup, G. H. (1982). Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 37-50.

Good, T. (1979). Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school: What we know about it now. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-64.

Holdaway, E. A. (1978). Satisfaction of teachers in Alberta with their work and working conditions. Report of a Study. Edmonton: University of Alberta, Department of Educational Administration. (ERIC Reproduction NO. ED 151 948).

Hoy, W. K. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 76, 312-323.

Hurt, H. T., & Teigen, C. W. (1977). The development of a measure of perceived organizational innovativeness. In B. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 1 (pp. 377-385). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. Communication Education, 34, 19-28.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom IV: Alternatives to discipline. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication yearbook 8 (pp. 724-746). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lawrenson, G., & McKinnon, A. J. (1980). Attribution, burnout and job satisfaction of teachers of the emotionally disabled. Paper presented at a Topical Conference of the Council for Exceptional Children, Minneapolis. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 195 104).

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4, 309-336.

Locke, E. A. (1970). Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5, 484-500.

McCaskill, E. O., Seifert, E. H., Neely, J. (1979). A research study about teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction. (Report No. EA 012 496). San Marcos, TX: Southwest Texas State University, Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 184 205).

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (in press). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training, and learning. Communication Education.

Morhrman, A. M., Cook, R. A., & Morhman, S. A. (1978). Participation in decision making: A multi-dimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 13-29.

Mouly, G. J. (1973). Psychology for effective teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, p. 483.

National Education Association (1981). Teacher opinion poll. The Journal of the National Education Association, 70, 82.

National Education Association (1983). Nationwide teacher opinion poll, 1983. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1985, May). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy, and affective learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., Stewart, R. A., & Downs, T. M. (1985). College student resistance toward teachers' use of selective control strategies. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., & Tucker, L. K. (1985). Prospective teachers' use of behavior alteration techniques on common student misbehaviors. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Richmond, V. P., Davis, L. M., Saylor, K., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power strategies in organizations: Communication techniques and messages. Human Communication Research, 11, 85-108.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1979). Management communication style, tolerance for disagreement, and innovativeness as predictors of employee satisfaction: A comparison of single-factor, two-factor, and multiple factor approaches. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3 (pp. 359-373). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Davis, L. M. (1982). Individual differences among employees, management communication style, and employee satisfaction: Replication and extension. Human Communication Research, 8, 170-188.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Stewart, R. A., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (in press). Locus of control as a mediator of college students' reactions to teacher compliance attempts. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), Communication yearbook 9. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Table 1

Behavior Alteration Techniques and Revised Messages for College Teachers

| Technique | Sample Messages |
|---|---|
| 1. Immediate Reward from Behavior | You will enjoy it. It will make you happy. Because it is fun. You will find it rewarding/ interesting. It is a good experience. |
| 2. Deferred Reward from Behavior | It will help you later on in life. It will prepare you for getting a job (or going to graduate school). It will prepare you for achievement tests (or the final exam). It will help you with upcoming assignments. |
| 3. Reward from Teacher | I will give you a reward if you do. I will make it beneficial to you. I will give you a good grade (or extra credit) if you do. I will make you my special assistant. |
| 4. Reward from Others | Others will respect you if you do. Others will be proud of you. Your friends will like you if you do. Your parents will be pleased. |
| 5. Self-Esteem | You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You always do such a good job. |
| 6. Punishment from Behavior | You will lose if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't. It's your loss. You'll feel bad if you don't. |
| 7. Punishment from Teacher | I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you. I'll give you an "F" if you don't. If you don't do it NOW, it will be homework tonight. |
| 8. Punishment from Others | No one will like you. Your friends will make fun of you. Your parents will punish you if you don't. Your classmates will reject you. |
| 9. Guilt | If you don't, others will be hurt. You'll make others unhappy if you don't. Your parents will feel bad if you don't. Others will be punished if you don't. |
| 10. Teacher/Student Relationship: Positive | I will like you better if you do. I will respect you. I will think more highly of you. I will appreciate you more if you do. I will be proud of you. |
| 11. Teacher/Student Relationship: Negative | I will dislike you if you don't. I will lose respect for you if you don't. I will think less of you if you don't. I won't be proud of you. I'll be disappointed in you. |

Table 1 (continued)

| Technique | Sample Messages |
|---|---|
| 12. Legitimate-Higher Authority | Do it, I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule, I have to do it and so do you. It's school policy. |
| 13. Legitimate-Teacher Authority | Because I told you to. You don't have a choice. You're here to work! I'm the teacher, you're the student. I'm in charge, not you. Don't ask, just do it. |
| 14. Personal (Student) Responsibility | It is your obligation. It is your turn. Everyone has to do his/her share. It's your job. Everyone has to pull his/her own weight. |
| 15. Responsiblity to Class | Your group needs it done. The class depends on you. All your friends are counting on you. Don't let your group down. You'll ruin it for the rest of the class. |
| 16. Normative Rules | The majority rules. All of your friends are doing it. Everyone else has to do it. The rest of the class is doing it. It's part of growing up. |
| 17. Debt | You owe me one. Pay your debt. You promised to do it. I did it the last time. You said you'd try this time. |
| 18. Altruism | If you do this it will help others. Others will benefit if you do. It will make others happy if you do. I'm not asking you to do it for yourself; do it for the good of the class. |
| 19. Peer Modeling | Your friends do it. Classmates you respect do it. The friends you admire do it. Other students you like do it. All your friends are doing it. |
| 20. Teacher Modeling | This is the way I always do it. When I was your age, I did it. People who are like me do it. I had to do this when I was in school. Teachers you respect do it. |
| 21. Expert Teacher | From my experience, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has always worked for me. Trust me - I know what I'm doing. I had to do this before I became a teacher. |
| 22. Teacher Feedback | Because I need to know how well you understand this. To see how well I've taught you. To see how well you can do it. It will help me know your problem areas. |

Table 2

Significant Correlations Between Selective

BAT Use and Teacher Satisfaction

Study 1 and Study 2

| BAT | Total SAT | Teaching SAT | Student SAT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Study 1 (elementary and secondary N = 351) | | | |
| 1 | .14 | .12 | .11 |
| 2 | -- | -- | -.10 |
| 5 | .13 | -- | .13 |
| 6 | -.19 | -.15 | -.17 |
| 7 | -.17 | -.12 | -.17 |
| 12 | -.15 | -.15 | -- |
| 13 | -.27 | -.25 | -.16 |
| 16 | -- | -.14 | -- |
| 20 | -.11 | -- | -- |
| 21 | -.13 | -.16 | -- |
| Study 2 (college N = 326) | | | |
| 1 | .19 | .20 | .12 |
| 2 | .13 | .12 | .10 |
| 4 | .12 | -- | .12 |
| 5 | .13 | -- | .12 |
| 9 | .12 | -- | .16 |
| 15 | .12 | -- | .12 |
| 18 | .13 | -- | .13 |
| 19 | .15 | .10 | .15 |

Correlations below .10 are nonsignificant for both samples, $p > .05$.